

were aware of the change in counsel, and understood that Steptoe attorneys would need time to become educated about the case. Based on their best judgment, Holcomb + Ward represented that counsel raised no objection to a schedule that provided for Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction to be filed by Wednesday, August 30th, Defendants' Response to be filed by Tuesday, September 5th and oral argument to be held the week of September 21st.

Since the August 22nd teleconference, Steptoe counsel have worked diligently to get up-to-speed on the case, and to prepare the Motion and Memorandum of Law. In the process of preparing the Motion and Memorandum, and marshaling the evidentiary support, counsel has found that the process of mastering the extensive and complex factual record has required considerably more time than the Holcomb attorneys anticipated in agreeing to the August 30th filing date for the Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

In light of, and consistent with, the facts set forth above, Plaintiffs respectfully seek a modest extension of time, until Tuesday, September 5th, by which to file the Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Plaintiffs further suggest that the date for Defendants to respond to Plaintiffs' Motion be set for Tuesday, September 12th, which provides Defendants an additional day (beyond what was provided under the existing schedule) by which to respond to Plaintiffs' Motion.

Plaintiffs note that a reply brief, which is permitted under local rules, was not discussed during the telephonic conference. Plaintiffs propose that they would file such a reply three days later, on Friday, September 15th. Plaintiffs would further propose that the Court hold a hearing on the Motion for Preliminary Injunction as soon as practicable thereafter.

Plaintiffs fully understand the importance of proceeding with this case in an efficient and expedited manner, and the necessity of receiving a ruling from the Court in sufficient time to allow Defendants to carry out administrative tasks before the upcoming November 7th election, should the Court rule in Plaintiffs' favor. However, based on the Defendants' August 25 submission regarding the required steps, coupled with the fact that the upcoming election is expected to involve a relatively small voter turnout, Plaintiffs believe that the amount of time the Defendants will need to prepare for the election does not warrant as compressed a schedule as the one under which the parties are currently operating.

Through the process of briefing and arguing this Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Plaintiffs intend to demonstrate that readying the electronic equipment needed for a three county municipal election would not be particularly time-consuming or arduous, and will similarly be able to show that printing a paper ballot for every voter in the three Defendant counties would present only an

extremely modest financial burden, particularly since Defendants must already print paper ballots for absentee mail-in voters and have ballots available at polling places in the event of an emergency, such as a power outage, that would prevent the casting of electronic ballots.

Plaintiffs are not insensitive to the redundancies that would come with preparing for both electronic and paper voting. However, inconvenience to the government (particularly where, as here, it is rather slight) and a monetary expenditure (particularly where, as here, it is rather modest) should not outweigh the interests of Plaintiffs, and other affected voters, in pursuing their goal of ensuring that the November 7th election be as private and secure as the law requires.

To the extent that Plaintiffs seek expedited discovery – a topic that was discussed in the August 22 call with the Court – they will file an amended motion for such discovery simultaneously with the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

Plaintiffs' counsel contacted counsel for Defendants, who did not consent to this Motion.

Plaintiffs also seek an increase to the page limit by an additional 15 pages, to ensure that they adequately present the information necessary for the Court to issue a ruling on the merits.

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request an extension of time for the deadlines related to the preliminary injunction motion and leave to file additional pages.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of August, 2017.

/s/ Bryan Ward
Bryan Ward, Esq.
Georgia Bar No. 736656
Marvin Lim, Esq.
Georgia Bar No. 147236
Holcomb + Ward LLP
3399 Peachtree Rd NE, Suite 400
Atlanta, GA 30326
(404) 601-2803
(404) 393-1554
Bryan.Ward@holcombward.com
Marvin@holcombward.com

Edward Schwartz (Application for Admission Pro Hac Vice pending)
Joseph Caldwell (Application for Admission Pro Hac Vice pending)
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Telephone: (202) 429-3000
Facsimile: (202) 429-3902
eschwartz@steptoe.com
jcaldwell@steptoe.com

CERTIFICATE PURSUANT TO L.R. 7.1D

I hereby certify that this Motion conforms to the requirements of L.R. 5.1C.

This Motion is written in 14 point Times New Roman font.

/s/ Bryan Ward

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that Plaintiffs – through their attorney – filed their **MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION MOTION AND ADDITIONAL PAGES** – to the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will automatically send email notification of such filing to the following attorneys of record:

Cristina Correia

Attorney General's Office-Atl
Department of Law
40 Capitol Square, SW
Atlanta, GA 30334
404-656-7063
Email: ccorreia@law.ga.gov

Josiah Benjamin Heidt

Georgia Department of Law
Office of the Attorney General
40 Capitol Square, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30334-1300
404-656-3389
Email: jheidt@law.ga.gov

Elizabeth Ahern Monyak

Attorney General's Office-Atlanta
Suite 668
40 Capitol Square, SW
Atlanta, GA 30334
404-463-0816
Fax: 404-651-6920
Email: emonyak@law.ga.gov

*Attorneys for the State of Georgia and The Center for Election Systems at
Kennesaw State University Defendants*

Cheryl Ringer

David R. Lowman

Kaye Woodard Burwell

Office of Fulton County Attorney
Fulton County Government Center
141 Pryor Street, S.W.
Suite 4038
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-612-0263
Email: cheryl.ringer@fultoncountyga.gov

Attorneys for the Fulton County Defendants

Bennett Davis Bryan

DeKalb County District Attorney's Office
Stone Mountain Judicial Circuit
556 North McDonough Street
Suite 700
Decatur, GA 30030
404-687-3815
Email: bdbryan@dekalbcountyga.gov

Attorney for the DeKalb County Defendants

Daniel Walter White

Haynie Litchfield Crane & White
222 Washington Avenue
Marietta, GA 30060
770-422-8900
Fax: 770-424-8900
Email: dwhite@hlclaw.com

Attorney for the Cobb County Defendants

Russell Dunn Waldon

Waldon Adelman Castilla Hiestand & Prout
900 Circle 75 Parkway, N.W.
Suite 1040
Atlanta, GA 30339-3084
770-933-7022
Email: rwaldon@wachp.com

Attorney for Thomas Jonathan Ossoff

I further certify that I have served, by U.S. mail, first class postage prepaid, the following Non-CM/ECF participants:

Anne Ware Lewis

Strickland Brockington Lewis LLP
1170 Peachtree St. NE
Atlanta, GA 30309
678-347-2204
anne.lewis@sbllaw.com

Attorney for Representative Karen Handel

This 30th day of August, 2017.

/s/Bryan Ward
Bryan Ward, Esq.
Georgia Bar No. 736656
Marvin Lim, Esq.
Georgia Bar No. 147236
Holcomb + Ward LLP
3399 Peachtree Rd NE, Suite 400
Atlanta, GA 30326
(404) 601-2803
(404) 393-1554
Bryan.Ward@holcombward.com
Marvin@holcombward.com
Counsel for Plaintiffs